

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet(s) of drawing(s) includes changes to Figures 4 and 5 as requested by the Examiner to include reference numbers set forth in the specification with respect to those figures. No new matter has been introduced by the Replacement drawing figures.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet(s): Two sheets including Fig. 4 on one sheet and Fig. 5 on a second sheet.

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 26, 34, 38, 45, and 49. No claims have been added. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1 through 55 are pending.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as failing to include reference signs mentioned on pages 19-20 and 31-35 of the Specification. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Figures 4 and 5 to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5), as shown in "Replacement Sheets". The Drawings have been corrected as shown in the attached "Replacement Sheets" to fully include the reference numbers found on pages 19-20 and 31-35 of the Specification. No new matter has been entered into the application. Approval of the amended drawings and withdrawal of the outstanding objection is requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-55 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is the Examiner's position that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession

of the claimed invention. The Examiner has specifically pointed out the limitations of "ODBC-compliant format" and "a Cold Fusion" as not being described in the Specification.

In response to the rejection, it is respectfully submitted that the terms "ODBC-compliant format" and "Cold Fusion" are known in the art as application processing programs. In particular, ODBC is understood in the art as an acronym for "open database compliant" and is used consistently throughout the specification as such. Next, "Cold Fusion" is an Adobe™ product which facilitates generation and integration of data. Additional support for use of these terms is found at least on page 17, paragraph [0036] and page 28, paragraph [0065] of the originally filed application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, 34-39 and 45-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Macromedia, Inc., "Connecting to Oracle Databases"* (hereinafter "*Macromedia*") published in 2001. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

At the outset, attached is a Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 in which the Applicants attest to a Provisional Application filed on December 10, 2001, upon which the present application is based and claims priority. It is submitted that this filing date is prior to the "2001" copyright of the *Macromedia* publication. Moreover, the attached Declaration establishes that Applicant completed the invention described in the

Provisional Application prior to January 1, 2001, thereby antedating the "2001" *Macromedia* publication. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the *Macromedia* publication as a reference against the present application.

In the event that the Examiner persists in his rejections, the following are further offered in traversal of the outstanding rejections.

The independent claims are directed to a unique combination of features and steps which essentially enables data from one or more software applications to be rendered ultimately compatible at a user location without the user having to separately configure the information into a common format.

It is the Examiner's position that the *Macromedia* publication is generally directed to the invention substantially as claimed and refers specifically to ODBC drivers on page 1; Native drivers on page 1; connecting the Oracle server from Solaris with SQL on page 2; run ColdFusion servers on pages 2-3; and "providing data to the user" referring to pages 2-3 thereof.

To the contrary, *Macromedia* is utilizing both the ColdFusion application and the *slq** plus to connect to only one type of "software application" for the native drivers instead of using SLQ and ColdFusion as separate but interactive components for gathering data from distinct first and second software applications, respectively. For example, *Macromedia* explains that it is necessary to first connect to the server from Solaris with the *slq** plus before connecting from ColdFusion. See page 2 of *Macromedia*. In contrast, the present invention distinguishes between native data maintained in a first software application that is ODBC-compliant and native data

maintained in a second software application that is a format other than ODBC-compliant. In *Macromedia*, there is no distinction between the differently formatted data for the first and second software applications, and therefore no motivation to separately configure as well as integrate the Cold Fusion and SQL server means in the manner claimed in the present invention.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-6, 12-17, 23-28, 34-39 and 45-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 45 are in condition for allowance, as are claims 2-6, 13-17, 24-28, 35-39, and 46-50, respectively, at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1, 12, 23, 34 and 45, respectively.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-11, 18-22, 40-44 and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Macromedia, Inc.*, "Connecting to Oracle Databases" (hereinafter "*Macromedia*") published in 2001. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is submitted that *Macromedia* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest any specific software adaptation as recited in the above-identified dependent claims. Further, there is no motivation in *Macromedia* to address these adaptations since the publication fails to encompass the essence of the claimed invention found in the independent claims as explained above. Since *Macromedia* is merely an explanation of how to configure Oracle ColdFusion data sources for Windows NT and UNIX, any further details are outside the scope of that reference.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-11, 18-22, 40-44 and 51-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance for reasons set forth above, and further at least by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1, 12, 34 and 45, respectively.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 50-2961.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 29, 2006

By: Barbara A. Fisher
Barbara A. Fisher
Reg. No. 31,906

Timothy M. Hsieh
Reg. No. 42,672

Attachments: Replacement Sheet for Drawing Figure 4
Replacement Sheet for Drawing Figure 5
Declaration Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131